



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

subject leads to the assumption of a comparatively late origin of the planetary week. The Jewish week is of earlier date than this planetary week. Both were adopted by the early church, ran for a time side by side, and were finally combined. A detailed examination of the spread of the planetary week in the Roman Empire from 100 B. C. until 300 A. D. is one of the most attractive sections of this second chapter; followed by a study of the observance in the Christian church of the fourth and fifth centuries, the church making only this change that its week began with Sunday (*dies solis*) corresponding to the *κυριακή*, instead of with the Saturday of the pagan planetary week. (2) Most interesting is the third chapter, "Gang der Entwicklung," in which the author describes the gradual development and spread of the Jewish and the planetary week in the Roman Empire, finally resulting in the present nomenclature.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

BELMONT, MASS.

### THE PARABLES OF JESUS

Hardly five years after Jülicher finally completed his great work on the parables,<sup>1</sup> there appeared another book of generous proportions (about 500 pages) devoted to the same theme.<sup>2</sup> Its author is Dr. Chr. A. Bugge, of Christiania, who has previously published in Danish several monographs on topics relating to the teaching of Jesus. His purpose in this German work is to correct and supplement the treatise of Jülicher. More particularly he states that his book aims to show how the parables of Jesus are related to the rhetorical art of his age and people, as over against the Aristotelian standard set up by Jülicher. Then, too, he will urge a vigorous protest against what he regards as the arbitrary and bootless text emendation and reconstruction of this same writer. There has been, he feels, in our New Testament study too much literary criticism and too little historico-theological exposition, and hence the demand for a new presentation.

An introduction of ninety pages takes up the question of method in parable exposition. The work of the past is briefly noted, but the real beginning is made with Jülicher, whose arguments are reviewed and summarized; namely: that each parable seeks to illustrate one main thought;

<sup>1</sup> *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Bd. I. Freiburg, 1888; zweite Auflage, 1899. Bd. II, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu*. Ausgelegt von Chr. A. Bugge. Mit einer Einleitung über die Methode der Parabel-Auslegung. Giessen: Ricker, 1903. 406 pages. M. 5.40.

that its purpose is always to elucidate and never to obscure, and there is accordingly no room for a double purpose of revealing and hardening; that the allegories and allegorical elements were not an original part of Jesus' teaching. Are then, Bugge would ask, the evangelists so far wrong in their report of the parables of Jesus, whether because of their failure to understand or because of purposeful alteration; or, on the other hand, does this new theory fail to take account of all the facts? The historical evidence available indicates that this last alternative is the true one. Jülicher has yielded to the besetting temptation of logical minds to generalize too much. Starting with a definition of Aristotle according to which the sole office of the parable is to prove, he has proceeded, Procrustes-like, to make the parables fit this theory, in entire disregard of the accounts of the synoptists, which show that Jesus used various types of parable, with different purposes. And this is just what might be expected of Jesus, in view of the practice of contemporary Jewish teachers. Among other forms, he made use of paradox, and in proof sixteen examples are cited (e. g., Matt. 5: 29, 30; 8:22). The paradox differs from the parable in the seeming contradictoriness and unreasonableness of its statements, but is like it in needing translation (*Uebertragung, translatio*.) Reflection and knowledge of the situation are demanded for the understanding of such sayings. That a real relationship existed for the Jews between paradox and parable is manifest from the fact that they included both in the category of *maschal* (משל, Gk. παραβολή or παροιμία). In the *maschal* the fundamental notion is representation, rather than comparison, and it is this conception that is common to the group consisting of parable, fable, allegory, paradox, etc. We find, further, that from antiquity there has very readily and very frequently been associated with this attribute the conception of the enigmatical. Jülicher's assertion that this element is very largely a product of later scribal activity is not warranted. At considerable length passages are introduced and discussed to prove that both the illustrative and the enigmatical *maschal* were used in the classical period of the Old Testament, as well as in the talmudic age, the only difference being that the latter form came gradually to be more prominent. Mixed forms were also common, and it is often difficult to make a sharp distinction between parable and allegory. In the light of this usage, it is not strange that Jesus should speak as he does in Mark 4:11 and parallels. For the Jews of that time speaking in parables was under certain circumstances equivalent to speaking in riddles. It is manifestly unjust, when there is such a wide variety of forms of the *maschal* in the Old Testament, in the Hellenistic Wisdom literature,

and in the rabbinical writing, to limit Jesus to two or three forms which accord with a definition of Aristotle.

The statement of the evangelists regarding the double purpose of speaking in parables—to veil or conceal as regards the multitude, and to reveal as regards the disciples—refers not to parables in general, but to those employed on that particular occasion. Thus they can record without any sense of contradiction many other *meschalim* used for a very different end. Jülicher's interpretation, which gives the words a general application, disregards the actual evidence and puts theory in the place of historical investigation. Instead of being improbable, as he holds, there are several reasons making it very probable that Jesus used the "secret parables" for the double purpose stated in the gospels. Four such reasons are named and elaborated. They carry us into the realm of the self-consciousness of Jesus, and are a reminder of what the author has already stated, namely, that his book was written for the most part in Giessen.<sup>3</sup>

(1) Jesus, with his unique ideals of the Messiah and of the kingdom of God, must seem an enigma to his countrymen. It would be in accord with the demands of the situation for him to reveal himself in the enigmatical *maschal*. (2) Regard for the people would demand the same course. He must guard against an outburst of enthusiasm. This called for some method that would restrain the multitude, without at the same time in any way denying or minimizing his messianic pretensions. Confronted with the need of self-concealment made necessary by the situation in Matt., chap. 13, Jesus vindicated his procedure to himself and to his disciples by an appeal to Isaiah. The hardening seems included in God's plan for his kingdom. (3) Regard for the disciples would likewise call for the enigmatical *maschal* at this juncture. It gave him an opportunity to train them, by unfolding privately the hidden truth at a time when, by reason of their astonishment and perplexity, their minds would be most alert and receptive. He is likewise by this means enabled to continue his work with the people which as a true prophet he is bound to do. (4) Regard for his own self-development, what he owed to himself and his cause, would dictate the same course. To reveal openly now his messianic dignity and pretensions to his enemies would have been suicidal. Such are the reasons, Bugge holds, which make it evident that at this stage of his preaching of the kingdom no other course than the use of the enigmatical *maschal* was left to Jesus.

<sup>3</sup> The author of *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, Professor Baldensperger, is a member of the faculty of Giessen.

The classification of the parables is the next topic considered. Jülicher's division into comparisons (*Gleichnisse*), parables or fables, and narrative examples is pronounced inadequate. For the sake of convenience, thirty-six shorter forms are grouped together under the heading *Parabel-Embleme*—a word borrowed from the older Delitzsch, and another group of longer passages is entitled "Parables." The members of both these groups are classified under two main heads, argumentative and illustrative. Of these the latter approaches closely to allegory, and in expanded form is often hardly distinguishable therefrom. The argumentative parable seeks to substantiate the correctness of some moral teaching by the help of analogy drawn from everyday life or from nature, whereas the illustrative parable seeks for clearness and consistency without any real attempt to prove the correctness of the teaching with which it deals. Paradoxes and paradoxical comparisons are classed as didactic because they help to an understanding of what was not before known or comprehended. A diagram is given, showing the scope of the synoptical *maschal*. Its three main divisions are: (a) paradox, (b) parable, (c) allegory. Parable is subdivided, as stated above, into didactic, argumentative, and illustrative. The argumentative form presents either an example or an argument. Under the illustrative a distinction is made between the *Parousiagleichniss* and the symbol (*Sinnbild*). Only the Sower and the Tares are counted as allegories; the rest of the closely related secret parables of Matt., chap. 13, are symbols (*Sinnbilder*).

There can be no doubt that each of the longer parables aims to set forth one main thought. What this is, is usually indicated by some short, pithy sentence at the beginning or end; e. g., "For many are called, but few are chosen" (Matt. 22:14). This contains the quintessence of the parable, and is frequently introduced by some formula; e. g., "I say unto you." We are thus able to feel assured that we know how the disciples understood the parables, and how they have reproduced them in the gospels. Farther back than this we are not able to go, in spite of the claim of theorists to read a more original form between the lines. There is no reason to distrust the reliability of the synoptists; all the evidence is in their favor. This will be the conclusion of an untrammelled theology after it has proved its sources, which as a science it is bound to do. The gospels show evidences of composition and arrangement, and there is little, if any, difference between them in this respect. Contrary assertions are based on some theory of interdependence, rather than on the observable facts. It is probable that Jesus used the same parable on different occasions, with variations in its form and application. In cases like that

of the Talents and the Pounds we have no evidence warranting us in pronouncing one or the other form as unhistorical. Jesus was a great propagandist, and this means that there must have been in his teaching much reiteration.

Bugge begins the expository section of his book with "The Parables of the Secrets of the Kingdom of Heaven" in Matt., chap. 13, and Mark, chap. 4. Preceding this is a section emphasizing the need of a historical method of interpretation and explaining again the circumstances that led Jesus to adopt this particular method of teaching. A chapter of thirty pages on what may be learned from this group of parables regarding Jesus' conception of the kingdom of heaven follows the exegesis. The second exegetical section takes up "The Later Parables of the Kingdom in Matthew," and the third, "The Individual Parables of Luke." The material in these sections is very conveniently paragraphed and well arranged. In the case of each parable there are added at the close, under the caption "The History of Interpretation," a few important or curious points in the views of old interpreters. In the exegetical treatment textual questions receive scant notice. The method and the conclusions are throughout those for which the introduction has prepared us.

Many who find themselves in agreement with Bugge in his negative criticism of Jülicher's position will not feel that he has made a very considerable positive contribution to the discussion, at least none commensurate with the extent of his book. His contention that we are to come to the study of Jesus' parables from the Jewish side is undoubtedly correct, and would be granted readily by Jülicher himself. What is done to help to this end is claimed to be one of the chief merits of the treatise, and yet its service in this respect is comparatively small. There is no systematic study or use of sources. The author employs miscellaneous quotations, giving to them at times questionable interpretations.

The work here does not compare with what Paul Fiebig accomplishes in his little book, *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*.<sup>4</sup> In this the parabolic material of the Mechilta is classified and translated, and there follows a discussion, first as to whether the sections in question are allegories, and secondly, as to what light they throw on Jesus' use of parables. Fiebig's conclusion accords with the view of Bugge that Jesus did not probably limit himself to the so-called pure parable, but employed mixed forms.

Many of Bugge's positions are no more convincing or helpful in their

<sup>4</sup> *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*. Von Paul Fiebig. Tübingen und Leipzig: Mohr, 1904. 167 pages.

new dress than they have been in former writers. This is true of a view introduced several times, and more at length on pp. 95 ff., that Jesus came to use parables to a considerable extent only after he had failed of his purpose with an earlier mode of preaching, of which the Sermon on the Mount is a type. Or, it is said, he reaches a stage in his ministry where another form of teaching is demanded, and a distinction is made between the kinds of truth and the underlying purpose at different periods of his activity.

Keep to the sources is a repeated admonition, but our recapitulation of the introduction has shown that this is not an excellence of which our writer can always rightfully boast as over against Jülicher. It is easy to confound holding to the sources with upholding one's interpretation of the sources.

Bugge's book is a welcome addition to our parable literature, but it is impossible to place upon it as high an estimate as it claims for itself, or indeed as might be possibly accorded, did it not stand, as it inevitably must, in constant comparison with the masterly achievement of Jülicher.

WARREN J. MOULTON.

BANGOR, ME.

---

## RECENT LITERATURE IN CHURCH HISTORY

### EARLY CHRISTIANITY

While recent "finds" of ancient documents bearing on the earliest days of Christianity encourage the hope that there may be much more light to break on this subject from this source, it is becoming increasingly clear, on the other side, that the older and better-known sources have not yet given us all the information contained regarding it. At least the addition of two such works<sup>1</sup> to our literature, already so rich, on the history of the ancient church, as those by Harnack and Knopf, deepens the consciousness of the existence of problems of prime importance in this field, which neither the old and well-known data nor the later-discovered sources entirely solve.

As to how this new light is to break upon the question, the two works before us give quite clear indications. It is by disengaging the subject

<sup>1</sup> *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. By Adolph Harnack. Translated and edited by James Moffatt. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904, 1905. Vol. I, xv + 494; Vol. II, ix + 488 pages.

*Das nachapostolische Zeitalter: Geschichte der christlichen Gemeinden vom Beginn der Flavierdynastie bis zum Ende Hadrians*. Dargestellt von Rudolph Knopf. Tübingen: Mohr, 1905. xii + 468 pages. M. 9.